

County of Hamilton

WILLIAM W. BRAYSHAW, P.E.-P.S. COUNTY ENGINEER

700 COUNTY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

138 EAST COURT STREET

CINCINNATI, OHIO 45202-1232

PHONE (513) 632-8523

FAX (513) 723-9748

64th District #2 Integrating Committee Meeting Minutes
April 18, 1997 - 8:00 a.m.
Board of County Commissioners' Conference Room
Room 603, County Administration Building
Cincinnati, OH 45202

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Brayshaw at 8:10 a.m. Mr. Huddleston was out of town.

Support Staff present: Messrs. Cottrill, Cline, Bass, Vogel, Beck, Schlimm and Riddiough. Also present from the City of Cincinnati was Prem Garg.

Mr. Seitz moved approval of the District #2 Meeting Minutes of February 21, 1997; seconded by Mr. Heile and passed unanimously.

Mr. Cottrill explained the methods used to switch rounds and for disbursement of residual funds. He stated that he works closely with OPWC when residual funds become available for disbursement. The Support Staff tries to keep a consistent policy, but needs flexibility when dealing with matters involving the release of funds to a particular jurisdiction. Mr. Seitz asked exactly when Mr. Cottrill would decide to begin approaching these jurisdictions with funding offers. When Mr. Cottrill replied that no rigid parameters were in place to determine when calls should be made, Mr. Seitz recommended that the process should begin after our District balance exceeds either \$100,000 or 1/3 of the amount requested on the next project in line. Subsequent discussion by Committee members appeared to confirm that no clear consensus had been reached on an alternative procedure. The Committee agreed the methodology used in the past and currently being used has worked and should remain as is.

Mr. Cottrill presented three policy recommendations from the Support Staff regarding completeness of applications, facilities appearing in multiple applications, and how appeals will be considered. Mayor Savage moved adoption of the Support Staff policy recommendations; motion was seconded by Mr. Sykes and approved unanimously.

Mr. Mendes questioned the recommended wording for the ADDENDUM TO THE RATING SYSTEM under "Ability to Proceed". He was concerned that the statement defining a project as delinquent did not take into account circumstances where a notification letter was sent out (automatically triggered by the OPWC project tracking system) at the same time that a request for a time extension was under review by the OPWC staff. After much discussion, the Committee decided to incorporate the following sentence into Criterion 1 - Ability to Proceed:

64th District #2 Integrating Committee Meeting Minutes

April 18, 1997

The OPWC sends a letter to a jurisdiction which announces that its' project is going to be terminated when the project is sixty (60) days beyond the bid date shown on the original application and a time extension for the project has not previously been requested or has been denied.

Mr. Seitz moved approval of the Round 12 Rating System, as amended; seconded by Mayor Brooks and approved unanimously.

The Small Governments report was presented by Mr. Sykes. An organizational meeting was held on April 1, 1997, at which Mr. Sykes was reelected Chairman, a distinction commended by the rest of the Committee members. It appears that District #2 may have as many as three Small Governments projects approved for Round 12 funding. The next meeting of the Small Governments Commission will be held on May 13, 1997; Mr. Cottrill will attend in order to provide answers to any questions that might be raised during consideration of our projects.

Chairman Brayshaw reported that there will be a District Leadership Meeting with the OPWC staff on May 7, 1997. Tentatively, Chairman Brayshaw, Mr. Cottrill and Mr. Cline will be attending. Mr. Bass indicated that he may also be able to attend if he can resolve a schedule conflict on the date of the meeting.

Old Business - None

New Business - The subject of the Revolving Loan Fund was discussed. Mr. Cline stated he believed OPWC was still developing the eligibility guidelines for projects to be funded from the Revolving Loan Fund.

Mr. Cottrill reported the Support Staff is working on the economic health assessment to reflect current demographic and economic data. The revised economic health figures will be provided to the Committee members upon completion.

Chairman Brayshaw recommended that we wait until July to have our next meeting. Everyone agreed, but due to a conflict of one Member's schedule, it will be held on the 4th Friday of July (July 25, 1997) rather than the usual 3rd Friday.

Mr. Cline pointed out that all the Members of the District #2 Integrating Committee are up for re-appointment as of May 31, 1997. The terms of the Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson will also expire on that date. If the Committee does not reconvene until July 25, 1997, the Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson will have to be chosen as the first order of business at that meeting.

Mr. Heile moved adjournment at 9:00 a.m.; seconded by Mr. Sykes and approved unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,



Joan Cornelius
Recording Secretary

cc: Support Staff

WHEN TO SWITCH ROUNDS

LEAVE THE CURRENT METHOD IN PLACE.

Currently, the District Liaison Officer and the OPWC Representative work in conjunction on determining when switching from one funding round to another is appropriate. Usually, this happens a few weeks after the newly submitted round is approved for funding by OPWC. However, this is not set in stone, and allows for maximum flexibility to either keep a round open, or go to the new round. The overall interest of the District is the prime consideration.

HOW TO DISTRIBUTE RESIDUAL FUNDS

LEAVE THE CURRENT METHOD IN PLACE.

When the District files a funding round with OPWC, the first fifteen applications below the cut line are also submitted. If one or more previously funded projects are completed (or terminated), OPWC sees if there are sufficient monies to fully fund the next project in line on the Priority Listing (as passed by the Integrating Committee). If there are, OPWC automatically funds the next project. If there are insufficient funds to fund the next project, but still a substantial amount, OPWC contacts the District Liaison and discusses the situation. The District Liaison then contacts the jurisdiction with the next project in line and offers them the funds. A reasonable amount of time is given (and always has) so that the jurisdiction may talk it over with their officials. This time varies with each situation. It is not uncommon for two weeks to pass before an answer is requested by the Liaison. If the affected jurisdiction turns down the request, the process is repeated until it is accepted. Usually, it is accepted after no more than three attempts. Keep in mind that these funds are not offered to anyone unless there are enough funds to make doing any project worthwhile. Small amounts that no one could utilize are not be offered. The balance will be allowed to grow until substantial amounts are there to offer. This also allows for maximum flexibility administering the Districts' funds.

SUPPORT STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS TO BE MADE POLICY BY THE INTEGRATING COMMITTEE:

-
1. It is the policy of the District 2 Integrating Committee, regarding applications that are not complete when submitted, that If the rating team reports that the application has important items missing (such as signed and sealed construction estimate, full description of scope of work for the project, no additional support information, etc.), that application shall be considered incomplete and not rated by the Support Staff. The application and a letter explaining the situation shall be sent to the affected jurisdiction. This cannot be appealed unless the applicant can demonstrate that the information was included in the original application.

The Support Staff will review an application for completeness IF it is received no later than one week before the deadline for receiving applications. The Support Staff will contact the affected jurisdiction and allow three business days for missing item(s) to be submitted. This will not apply unless the conditions listed above are followed.

2. A FACILITY MAY BE APPLIED FOR ONLY ONCE IN ANY GIVEN ROUND. FOR INSTANCE, A ROADWAY MAY BE APPLIED FOR EITHER IN A SEPARATE APPLICATION, OR WITH A GROUP OF STREETS, BUT NOT IN BOTH.
-

3. IF A JURISDICTION APPEALS A PROJECT RATING, THE SUPPORT STAFF MAY, UPON REVIEW OF THE APPEAL, INCREASE OR DECREASE THE POINTS OF THE APPEALED CATEGORY.
-

SCIP/LTIP PROGRAM
ROUND 12 - PROGRAM YEAR 1998
PROJECT SELECTION CRITERIA
JULY 1, 1998 TO JUNE 30, 1999

JURISDICTION/AGENCY: _____

NAME OF PROJECT: _____

PRELIMINARY SCORE FOR THIS PROJECT: _____

FINAL SCORE FOR THIS PROJECT: _____

RATING TEAM: _____

- | | |
|--|---------------|
| | <u>POINTS</u> |
| 1) If SCIP/LTIP funds are granted, when would the construction contract be awarded? (See Addendum for definition of delinquency) | _____ |
| 10 Points - Will be under contract by end of 1998 and no delinquent projects in Rounds 9 & 10. | |
| 5 Points - Will be under contract by March 30, 1999 and/or jurisdiction has had one delinquent project in Rounds 9 & 10. | |
| 0 Points - Will not be under contract by March 30, 1999 and/or jurisdiction has had more than one delinquent project in Rounds 9 & 10. | |
| 2) What is the physical condition of the existing infrastructure to be replaced or repaired? (See Addendum for definitions) | _____ |
| 25 Points - Failed | |
| 23 Points - Critical | |
| 20 Points - Very Poor | |
| 17 Points - Poor | |
| 15 Points - Moderately Poor | |
| 10 Points - Moderately Fair | |
| 5 Points - Fair Condition | |
| 0 Points - Good or Better | |

NOTE: If the infrastructure is in "good" or better condition, it will NOT be considered for SCIP/LTIP funding unless it is an expansion project that will improve serviceability.

3) If the project is built, what will be its effect on the facility's serviceability? Documentation is required.

- 5 Points - Project design is for future demand.
- 4 Points - Project design is for partial future demand.
- 3 Points - Project design is for current demand.
- 2 Points - Project design is for minimal increase in capacity.
- 1 Point - Project design is for no increase in capacity.

4) How important is the project to *HEALTH, SAFETY, AND WELFARE* of the public and the citizens of the District and/or service area? (See Addendum for definitions)

- 10 Points - Highly significant importance, with substantial impact on all 3 factors.
- 8 Points - Considerably significant importance, with substantial impact on 2 factors, or noticeable impact on all 3 factors.
- 6 Points - Moderate importance, with substantial impact on 1 factor or noticeable impact on 2 factors.
- 4 Points - Minimal importance, with noticeable impact on 1 factor
- 2 Points - No measurable impact

5) What is the overall economic health of the jurisdiction?

- 10 Points
- 8 Points
- 6 Points
- 4 Points
- 2 Points

6) What matching funds are being committed to the project, expressed as as a percentage of the *TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST*? Loan and Credit Enhancement projects automatically receive 5 points, and no match is required. All grant funded projects require a minimum of 10% matching funds.

- 5 Points - 50% or more
- 4 Points - 40% to 49.99%
- 3 Points - 30% to 39.99%
- 2 Points - 20% to 29.99%
- 1 Point - 10% to 19.99%

- 7) Has any formal action by a federal, state, or local government agency resulted in a partial or complete ban of the usage or expansion of the usage for the involved infrastructure? **POINTS MAY ONLY BE AWARDED IF THE END RESULT OF THE PROJECT WILL CAUSE THE BAN TO BE LIFTED.**

5 Points - Complete ban
3 Points - Partial ban
0 Points - No ban of any kind

- 8) What is the total number of existing daily users that will benefit as a result of the proposed project? Appropriate criteria include current traffic counts, households served, when converted to a measurement of persons. Public transit users are permitted to be counted for the roads and bridges, but only when certifiable ridership figures are provided.

5 Points - 16,000 or more
4 Points - 12,000 to 15,999
3 Points - 8,000 to 11,999
2 Points - 4,000 to 7,999
1 Point - 3,999 and under

- 9) Does the infrastructure have regional impact? Consider originations and destinations of traffic, functional classifications, size of service area, number of jurisdictions served, etc. **(See Addendum for definitions)**

5 Points - Major impact
4 Points -
3 Points - Moderate impact
2 Points -
1 Point - Minimal or no impact

- 10) Has the jurisdiction enacted the optional \$5 license plate fee, an infrastructure levy, a user fee, or a dedicated tax for infrastructure and provided certification of which fees have been enacted?

5 Points - Two of the above
3 Points - One of the above
0 Points - None of the above

ADDENDUM TO THE RATING SYSTEM DEFINITIONS/CLARIFICATIONS

Criterion 1 - ABILITY TO PROCEED

The Support Staff will assign points based on engineering experience and OPWC defined delinquent projects. A project will be considered delinquent when any of the following occurs: 1) A letter is sent from the OPWC to the affected jurisdiction stating that the project has not moved in accordance with the time frame listed on the application (copies are sent to the District); or 2) no time extension has been granted by the OPWC; or 3) A jurisdiction receiving approval for a project subsequently terminates the same after the bid date on the application.

2 - CONDITION

Condition is based on the amount of deterioration that is field verified or documented exclusive of capacity, serviceability, or health, safety and welfare issues. Condition is rated only on the existing facility being repaired or abandoned. If the existing facility is not being abandoned or repaired, but a new facility is being built, it shall be considered as an expansion project. (Documentation may include ODOT BR-86 reports, pavement management condition reports, televised underground system reports, age inventory reports, maintenance records, etc., and will only be considered if included with the original application.)

Definitions:

MAILED CONDITION - Requires complete reconstruction where no part of the existing facility is salvageable. (e.g. Roads: complete reconstruction of roadway, curbs and base; Bridges: no part of the bridge can be salvaged; Underground: removal and replacement of an underground drainage or water system; Hydrants: completely non-functioning and replacement parts are unavailable.)

CRITICAL CONDITION - Requires moderate or partial reconstruction to maintain integrity. (e.g. Roads: reconstruction of roadway, curbs can be saved; Bridges: only the substructure can be salvaged with modifications; Underground: removal and replacement of part of an underground drainage or water system; Hydrants: some non-functioning, others obsolete and replacement parts are unavailable.)

VERY POOR CONDITION - Requires extensive rehabilitation to maintain integrity. (e.g. Roads: extensive full depth, partial depth and curb repair of a roadway with a structural overlay; Bridges: substructure and superstructure can be salvaged with extensive repairs; Underground: repair of joints and/or minor replacement of pipe sections; Hydrants: non-functioning and replacement parts are available.)

POOR CONDITION - Requires standard rehabilitation to maintain integrity. (e.g. Roads: moderate full depth, partial depth and curb repair to a roadway with no structural overlay needed or structural overlay with minor repairs to a roadway needed; Bridges: deck cannot be salvaged, substructure and superstructure need repair; Underground: insituform or other in ground repairs; Hydrants: functional, but leaking and replacement parts are unavailable.)

MODERATELY POOR CONDITION - Requires minor rehabilitation to maintain integrity. (e.g. Roads: minor full depth, partial depth or curb repairs to a roadway with either a thin overlay or no overlay needed; Bridges: deck can be salvaged with repairs and overlay; Hydrants: functional and replacement parts are available.)

integrity. (e.g. Roads: thin or no overlay with extensive crack sealing, minor partial depth and/or slurry or rejuvenation; Bridges: deck rehabilitation required, overlay not required.)

FAIR CONDITION - Requires routine maintenance to maintain integrity. (e.g. Roads: slurry seal, rejuvenation or routine crack sealing to the roadway; Bridges: minor rehabilitation required.)

GOOD OR BETTER CONDITION - Little or no maintenance required to maintain integrity; Bridges: no work required.

Criterion 4 - *HEALTH, SAFETY & WELFARE*

Definitions:

SAFETY - The design of the project will prevent accidents, promote safer conditions, and eliminate or reduce the danger of risk, liability, or injury.

EXAMPLES: Widening existing roadway lanes to standard lane widths; Adding lanes to a roadway or bridge to increase capacity or alleviate congestion; replacing old or non-functioning hydrants; increasing capacity to a water system, etc.

HEALTH - The design of the project will improve the overall condition of the facility so as to reduce or eliminate disease; or correct concerns regarding the environmental health of the area.

EXAMPLES: Improving or adding storm drainage or sanitary facilities; replacing lead joints in water lines;

WELFARE - The design of the project will promote economic well-being and prosperity.

EXAMPLES: Project has the potential to improve business expansions or opportunities in the area; project will improve the quality of life in the area;

PLEASE NOTE: The examples listed above are NOT a complete list, but only a small sampling of situations that may be relevant to any given project. Each project is looked at on an individual basis to determine if any aspects of this rating category apply, and if so, to what severity level (minor or significant). The severity and extent of the problem, as it relates to Health, Safety and Welfare, MUST be fully detailed by the applicant and apparent to the rating team. The Support Staff will not attempt to determine these issues on it's own. Without such detail the jurisdiction should expect a lower rating than the project may deserve.

Criterion 9 - *REGIONAL IMPACT*

Definitions:

MAJOR IMPACT - Roads: major multi-jurisdictional route, primary feed to an interstate, Federal Aid Primary routes; Underground: primary water or sewer main serving and entire system; Hydrants: multi-jurisdictional.

MODERATE IMPACT - Roads: principal thoroughfares, Federal Aid Urban routes; Underground: primary water or sewer main serving only part of a system; Hydrants: all hydrants in a local system serving only one jurisdiction.

MINIMAL/NO IMPACT - Roads: cul-de-sacs, subdivision streets; Underground: individual water or sewer main not part of a large system; Hydrants: only some hydrants in a local system serving only one jurisdiction.

64th District 2 Integrating Committee Meeting
County Commissioner's Conference Room
County Administration Building
Room 603

Cincinnati, Ohio 45202
April 18, 1997 - 8:00 a.m.

AGENDA

- 1.) Approval of previous meeting's minutes
- 2.) Support Staff Items:
 - (A) Explanation by the Support Staff on method used to switch rounds and disbursement of residual funds.
 - (B) Revised Staff recommendations for policy statements to be considered by the Integrating Committee.
 - (C) Round 12 Rating System for review by the Integrating Committee.
- 3.) Small Governments Subcommittee report.

Small Governments Commission will vote on projects Tuesday, May 13.
- 4.) Old business.
- 5.) New business.

Chairman Brayshaw, Joe Cottrill and Richard Cline will be attending a District Leadership Conference on Wednesday, May 7, 1997 in Columbus. Discussion will include details on Revolving Loan Funds, which will be available with the Round 12 allocation.
- 6.) Next meeting date is Friday, May 16, 1997. (If needed.)
- 7.) Adjourn.

64th District #2 Integrating Committee Meeting
Board of County Commissioners' Conference Room
Room 603, County Administration Building
Cincinnati, OH 45202

April 18, 1997 - 8:00 a.m.

ATTENDANCE LIST

<u>NAME</u>	<u>AFFILIATION</u>	<u>PHONE NO.</u>
Richard MENDES	City of Cinc.	352-2459
DAVE SIMPSON	HCMC	821-7266
Joe Sykes	H.C.T.A.	941 3393
John Hammer	City of Cincinnati	352-3218
Peter Heile	" " "	352-3337
Bill Seitz	Green Twp.	352-9332
Bill Brayshaw	Ham. County	632-8630
DAN BROOKS	HCMC	521-7413